

# CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER AND EASTERN CHRONICLE.

"WERE ONCE THESE MAXIMS FIX'D,—THAT GOD'S OUR FRIEND, VIRTUE OUR GOOD, AND HAPPINESS OUR END, HOW SOON MUST REASON O'ER THE WORLD PREVAIL, AND ERROR, FRAUD AND SUPERSTITION FAME."

VOL. XI.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY  
BY SHELDON & DICKMAN.

WILLIAM A. DREW.—Editor.

## RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

[From the Trumpet and Magazine.]

### RISE AND PROGRESS OF INFIDELITY IN AMERICA. No. 1.

MR EDITOR:—It will be conceded by your readers, as also by the public generally, that we live in an age of improvement. The world seems to have emerged from a state of darkness, and to have entered the field of investigation. This is emphatically true of the inhabitants of republican America. While it would be manifestly improper to assure that we have already attained to the highest degree of intellectual or moral improvement, we hazard nothing in saying, that no nation on earth has made more rapid progress than ours, during the last half century, or is now in a fairer way of obtaining the highest and best blessings that man is capable of enjoying.

Were it necessary to adduce proof to substantiate the foregoing statement, we might mention our civil, religious and literary institutions; the general dissemination of useful knowledge—or, at any rate, the thousand ways and means of obtaining it; the liberty of conscience, of speech, and of the press, enjoyed throughout our country; and the superabundance of all the products of the earth, with which a kind Providence rewards the exemplary industry of our citizens. These may be considered as so many sources, not only of happiness, but of inducements to still greater exertions in the work of improvement than have hitherto been made—they are the pledges of future, as well as the proofs of our present and past prosperity.

It would afford the writer of this article much pleasure to be able to say, that there are no evils intermixed with our blessings; but, however reluctantly it may be done, it must be confessed, that great and alarming evils do exist; and among the worst, we must class that INFIDELITY which is beginning to attract some notice in this country, and which is boldly advocated by some, who would be regarded as men of sense and discernment.

Were the persons, characters, and motives of the individuals who publicly advocate Atheism, known by the readers of your paper, I might spare myself the trouble of attempting an exposure of them; and if any, better acquainted with these matters than myself, will take the trouble off my hands, I will, at any time, relinquish the unpleasant task I have undertaken. But being persuaded that there are many who know little or nothing more of the persons or motives of those self-styled reformers than what has been learned from their own recent statements, believing their motives to be of the worst kind, and that the only cure for the evil is a plain statement of facts—and, moreover, knowing that I have access to such sources of information as may be relied on, and believing, that by throwing before your readers the facts with which I happen to be acquainted I may be the means of saving some, perhaps many, from being entangled in the snare which has been laid for their feet; I shall, with your permission, attempt a feeble exposure of the arts, plans, and management of those, who would fain sap the foundation of every institution of America, and poison every source of rational enjoyment.

But, why—it may be asked, should an individual, too obscure to be injured by the prevalence of Atheism, take upon himself the task of exposing its advocates? Why not let them alone? My answer is this: I am an Universalist; I have believed—I have enjoyed the divine comforts which flow from the hope of an immortality common to the whole human race! Those Atheists who have been looked upon as the champions of their party, have, with an affected, and therefore disgusting liberality, pretended to wish well to the cause of Universalism—they have approached us with arms extended to receive us—and, while we with characteristic generosity, stifled the emotions of abhorrence with which our bosoms were agitated, and treated them with some degree of courtesy, they, with more assurance than discretion, hailed us as brethren; and, because we would not abuse them as did other denominations of Christians, vainly imagined that we should be the first to fall in with their schemes!—Some few of those who were attached to our sentiments, were won over to their cause—it cause it may be called—and this, we have reason to believe, was regarded by them as a favorable omen; and they may have flattered themselves, that, since they had taken a few, who had wandered away from our citadel, they would ultimately succeed in drawing from our place of safety many more.

Believing that I have had opportunities to become acquainted with the principles of those whose names are incorporated into the previous article, and feeling confident that such opportunities have not been wholly misimproved—believing, also, that the information I possess may be of some little service to the public, I shall submit it, accompanied with such reflections as may be suggested to my mind,

disguise, we look upon their principles with unqualified disgust, and deep abhorrence; and that, sooner than embrace, or countenance their abominable schemes, we would covet the pains of martyrdom, and seek for the repose of the grave.

But this is not all. There are many in community, who, having become disgusted with the extravagances of those who claim to be exclusively orthodox, are seeking for something more rational and satisfactory; and there is danger, that such, being unacquainted with the details of the system of Christianity as taught by Universalists, may be enticed from the path of wisdom into the regions of Atheistical speculation; and in going from the presence of a God whose character they cannot admire, may walk blindfolded into that state in which the mind admits the existence of none! And farther; it is known by all who have read the writings of the leaders of the Atheistical party in this country, that their moral principles are such—so palpably subversive of every thing that civilized man calls good, that no one who pretends to respectability, can possibly approve of them. Nay, we will go farther, and say, that there are but few in this community so degraded as to be barefaced enough to avow any predilections for those sentiments. I know not of one among the disciples of Frances Wright and her coadjutors, but would blush at a statement of their real principles; and we hesitate not to say, that the human mind must become greatly polluted before it can reflect, with any degree of satisfaction, upon what are really the moral principles of those persons. But still, many honest and well meaning persons, being ignorant of the real sentiments of those, who for reasons best known to themselves, have assumed the prerogative of giving instruction to their fellow beings, have been induced to lend their assistance to a cause, which, if known, would be unhesitatingly disapproved.—How can we render a greater service to such individuals than by communicating that information which will again clothe them in their right minds?

But who are the leaders of this party, whose principles and plans are represented as being so bad? and what are those principles? To the first question I reply, Robert Owen; Frances Wright; Robert Dale Owen; Robert L. Jennings, and Abner Koeland, are the persons intended. With the private characters of these individuals we have nothing to do, farther than to express the hope that they have not acted consistently with their own principles. An answer to the second inquiry will be given in subsequent numbers, to which we must refer the candid reader; premising at this time, that those principles which they have publicly avowed, and those plans which they have at different times laid before the public, are such as to excite no other than feelings of deep abhorrence, and to cause the compassionate to lament that there should be found among men those hardened enough to avow them.

A word to the persons whose names have been mentioned will close this introductory article. Should this and the following numbers fall into their hands, they may be assured that the writer has undertaken the task of exposing their mad schemes, with the determination to give the public a fair representation of every subject he may touch upon. If he fail in this, it will not be for the want of a disposition to do ample justice to the individuals concerned, and to the public, upon whose indulgence they have so long trespassed with impunity. Should he misstate any material fact, he will cheerfully correct it; but if it so happens that truth when plainly told shall lead them to reply, no notice will be taken of what they may say. My next number will contain an exposition of the views of Robert Owen, and such remarks as may be thought necessary, upon his opinions and conduct.

AN UNIVERSALIST.  
RISE AND PROGRESS OF INFIDELITY  
IN AMERICA. No. 2.

When men pretend to have made important discoveries, and boldly set up their claims upon the confidence and respect of their fellow beings, it becomes the privilege—nay the duty, of all who can in any way be benefited or injured by their doctrines, or examples, to ascertain, if possible, the grounds on which their pretensions rest. But it is not unfrequently the case, that the mass of mankind find themselves in a situation which renders it next to impossible for them either to avail themselves of the advantages, or guard themselves against the evils of new systems; and this incapacity to act at all, or to act understandingly, is occasioned by the want of information relative to the principles of those who proffer the fruits of their investigations for the good of mankind.

Now the object—or at any rate one object, with the writer of this article is, to convince all who have calculated upon any such result, that, for once, they have reckoned without their host—that they have relied altogether too much upon the slanderous statements of our enemies! In a word, we would convince them, and the world, that so far from being infidels in

for the consideration of the candid of all denominations.

The writer of this article deems it proper to state, in the outset, that he has no personal hostility towards the individuals whose history is in a measure identified with modern infidelity—with most of them he has had some acquaintance; and, such are his feelings, that he would much rather, if in his power, so hide their imperfections, as to have them ranked among the objects upon whom compassion delights to bestow its kindest attentions, rather than expose them to the gaze of a fault-finding world, or their conduct to the just abhorrence of an enlightened and virtuous community. But, such are the pretensions—such the ostensible purposes—such the avowed principles of those persons, that, while in the exercise of reason, and influence by these considerations which the most virtuous approve, it is a thing next to impossible to speak plainly, or in a manner required by the exigencies of the times, without running the risk of being charged with a want of seriousness, and a destitution of charity. For, most certain it is, that the principles of some persons' are so extravagant, that a fair representation of them appears like a caricature; and so absurd are they, that we are never more liable to be charged with falsehood, than when speaking the words of truth and soberness.

Fully aware of the difficulties of the present undertaking, I am determined to go no farther in the following statements than I may be led by facts, leaving it for the public to draw their own inferences—Having before me the published statements and principles of those persons, I shall only go so far as I may be able to go safely; referring to chapter and verse, to substantiate my statements. And, that the public may rest assured of my sincerity, my name and address is left with the editor of the Trumpet, who has directions to surrender it to any respectable person who may seriously call in question the truth of what may follow.

Robert Owen of New Lanark, (Scotland) and his principles, first claim our attention, both on account of his age, and the circumstance of his having been the projector of the plan which we are about to examine. He was born in Montgomeryshire, in the principality of Wales, A.D. 1771, and is now about 59 years old. When quite young he commenced business for himself on a limited scale, in making machinery, and spinning cotton. He continued in this business, though at different places, for several years, and at length became concerned in a new company, called the "Charlton Twist Company," which subsequently purchased the mills and establishments at New Lanark. Here, to adopt the language of his Biographer, the editor of the New Harmony Gazette, he "continued before the public nearly twenty-five years," his mind continually engaged in studying plans for removing the evils which surround man from his birth.

At that place, as is well known, Mr. O. established a community, upon which he and his coadjutors have bestowed almost unqualified praise. But, strange as it may appear, he left that earthly paradise, to carry the fruits of his experience to other countries! Not, as charity would incline us to suppose, because his experiment had failed of success—for the plan there adopted and carried into execution was often mentioned, in other places, as a proof of the practicability, of a far more extensive improvement—of the entire change which he contemplated bringing about in the affairs of the whole world!—No—it was there, in that highly favored spot, that the experiment had been tried—the plan which was destined to "turn and overturn" until a complete revolution should be effected in the moral and physical world, had been carried into effect! And he, the experimental philosopher, the great reformer, the very Dr. of "circumstances," staggering under the weight of his wisdom, like Don Quixote clad in mail, with the sword of truth in his hand, ready to annihilate a "trinity of evils," left that dear spot, where all his hopes had budded and blossomed, and came over the waters to lift the light of his countenance upon the half civilized inhabitants of America! Suffice it to say, he landed in New York in the month of Nov. 1824.

The question may arise—why did this benevolent individual leave his native country and come to this? If successful at New Lanark, why did he not visit other manufacturing establishments in Scotland and England, and carry his plan into execution in those places, where the poor laborers suffered most, and consequently most needed his assistance? His Biographer informs us—"Finding the general state of society in Europe not sufficiently advanced to adopt the *only principles* that can lead to the happiness of mankind, Mr. O. turned his attention to the western

continent." Strange indeed! Passing strange it is, that the state of society in Europe was not sufficiently advanced to adopt those principles which should lead mankind directly to happiness, and which, as will presently appear, were in their nature so potent, and with so self-evident, that when uttered by this wonderful man, they would spread to the utmost ends of the earth, and effect, in their rapid progress, an entire revolution in the state of society! Still more to be wondered at is the fact, that a man who had been so extremely wise, should have adopted the opinion that society in Europe was not sufficiently advanced to receive his principles, when in that very Europe, his plan had succeeded so well, that his success was to be held up to the inhabitants of this country as an inducement for them to accept of the blessings tendered them! But so it was; and we leave this matter to be explained by those circumstances which remain to be detailed.

It is not improbable that credulity and infidelity are twin sisters. This supposition is confirmed by the history of Robert Owen. He visited the city of Washington during the sitting of Congress, and there delivered lectures in explanation and defence of his New Views of Society. The novelty of his sentiments, and perhaps the extravagance of his pretensions, attracted considerable attention; but the number of his converts was extremely small, in comparison with the expectations he seems to have cherished. He soon purchased the estate in New Harmony owned by Mr. Rapp, consisting of about 30,000 acres of land and a number of buildings, and designated this as the spot on which his social system was to be carried into effect. His proclamation was made both of the purchase, and the object he had in view; and as might have been expected, an heterogeneous mass of human beings repaired to that new paradise. No doubt the great philosopher of circumstances entertained towards them all the kindness of a father; for he immediately set himself at work to provide for them in the best possible manner; and, that he looked upon them as his children is evinced by the fact, that he chose to manage their affairs himself, regarding them as being too ignorant of the doctrine of circumstances to be able to take care of themselves.

It cannot fail to amuse the curious reader, to be afforded an opportunity to look at a few extracts from his first address to those thus brought together: "I am come to this country"—he said, "to introduce an entire new system of society: to change it from the ignorant, selfish system, to an enlightened social system, which shall gradually unite all interests into one, and remove all cause of contest between individuals!" A modest beginning, tru!

He then goes on to speak of the evils of what he denominates the "individual system," and gives his hearers to understand that until it "shall be entirely abandoned, it will be useless to expect any substantial, permanent improvement in the condition of the human race"—and goes on to say, that "until the means were discovered, and can be brought into practice, by which universal charity, benevolence and kindness can be made to pervade the heart and mind of every human being, a state of society in which 'peace on earth and good will to man' shall exist, must remain unknown and unenjoyed by mankind." These means he professes to have discovered. "This knowledge," he goes on to say, "has been, until now, hidden from man." And what reader, do you think this great discovery amounts to?

The grand secret, according to his declaration, amounts to this—that man is a creature of circumstances, and is neither a proper subject of censure or praise!—That he ought not to be rewarded nor punished! That "he cannot become an object of anger or displeasure," &c.—But what benefit, it may be asked, could be expected to result from a knowledge of the fact that man is so completely controlled by circumstances? Reader! do not be impatient. You must know, then, that when man is brought to a knowledge of the fact that he is a creature of circumstances, that knowledge becomes a circumstance which will enable him to control all circumstances! Do not be surprised, then, that a person so wise as Mr. O. should use the following language: "I have bought this property, and have now come here to introduce this practice, and to render it familiar to all the inhabitants of this country." That is to say, having become the discoverer of this great secret, viz: that mankind are no more the subjects of censure or praise, of rewards and punishments, than the spinicles of a cotton factory, he had come into this country to let them know the fact, and to operate upon them, and the circumstances by which they were surrounded, so as to have them all as perfect machines as the nature of the case would allow!

Here we have the beginning of the whole concern; and it may be well to observe that he declared, without reservation, that he possessed the knowledge requisite to enable him to carry into full

NEW SERIES, VOL. V.—NO. 10.

effect his plan for the destruction of all evil. We pause to inquire whether he is to be denominated an enthusiast, a madman, or visionary adventurer. We only say of him that if he had spent twenty five years in ascertaining the cause and cure of evil, he had become too much enamored with his own wisdom, to see very clearly the true state of the case.—We hazard nothing in saying that he has entitled himself to the privilege of being called a weak and vain philosopher by all who are not as wild and extravagant as himself.

A UNIVERSALIST.

BALFOUR'S REPLY TO STUART.

We insert, with pleasure, the following notice of Mr. Balfour's late publication, from our respected friend whose name is affixed. In the sentiments he expresses, and the recommendation he gives, we most cheerfully concur.—Trumpet.

To the serious, candid inquirers after truth, of all Christian denominations.

BRETHREN—In compliance with what I feel to be a duty binding on me, I would earnestly invite your attention to the controversy between Prof. Stuart and Rev. Walter Balfour, on the subject of a heretical state of punishment. There has certainly no subject, of greater moment, been controverted, in any age of the Christian church; nor can we conceive of one, a correct decision of which would add so much to the amount of valuable improvement, which distinguishes our times from former days. If the doctrine, which the Professor advocates, and which teaches that some of the human family will be subjected to never-ending punishment, taught by divine revelation, so essentially affects the moral character of our Creator, and operates with such consequences to ourselves, that to regard it as a subject of indifference seems to indicate a reprehensible stupidity. Is the doctrine to which I here refer, could be reconciled with the universally acknowledged attributes of a God of infinite wisdom, power and goodness; and could its reality be shown to accord with our knowledge of moral principles, it certainly would not have been necessary for the Professor to have undertaken to defend it, by the use of certain words, in those languages in which the scriptures were originally written. On this task he has bestowed great labor, displayed more learning than humble Christians in general can possibly understand; and after travelling through doubtful criticisms, and setting aside the authorities of the most approved critics, even of his own creed, and in opposition to his own rules, he comes to the conclusion that if the doubtful words *aion* and *aionios* do not prove the endless duration of punishment, he must give up his belief in the endless duration of God and heaven!

Mr. Balfour has patiently and with minute accuracy, followed the Professor through the labyrinth of learning in which he has conducted his arguments, making use of the rules of scripture exposition which the Professor has laid down; and in every instance, wherein the argument regards the merits of the question in debate, comes to a result directly contrary to that of his opponent.

These unhappy people, in our enlightened community, who believe in the tremendous and distressing doctrine which Prof. Stuart has endeavored to prove, are deeply interested in this controversy. If as is confidently believed, the scriptures can, by fair construction, be freed from this doctrine, it is certainly due to them, it is abundantly due to our heavenly Father's moral character and perfections, and it is a most blessed privilege to which his children are entitled. To treat this subject with neglect, or with cold indifference is a conduct deserving of severe animadversion. I do, therefore, seriously and earnestly invite all such believers carefully to read what the learned Professor has published in vindication of this doctrine, and also, what the Rev. Walter Balfour has published in reply. The expense of these works, in comparison with the weight of their subject, is nothing.—The time required for a careful examination of them may be conveniently spared, from the necessary avocations of the most industrious part of the community.

Notwithstanding Universalists have already fully satisfied themselves on this subject, and may possibly think that the expense and labor would be of little value to them, they are reminded that by rendering the arguments, which these writings furnish, familiar to their minds, they will be better enabled to introduce them in kind and friendly conversation with our brethren of opposing denominations, and thereby render a most beneficial service to the interest of truth and humanity.

As soon as people in general shall become acquainted with the right meaning and proper use of the few words, behind which the clergy have hid themselves, as in a fortification, and which they have used as a commanding battery, to silence the arguments of reason and moral philosophy, they will no longer be enslaved by their means. It is a question which professors in Biblical literature would do well to consider, how it will appear to the lovers of God and Christianity, who may live fifty years hence, in the enjoyment of

\* How it should happen that Mr. Owen "continued before the public" for so many years, while at New Lanark, may surprise the reader at first; but the fact is accounted for by the extreme modesty of his Biographer, who, in giving the history of this wonderful man, saw proper to state the simple fact, that he was before the public during that term of time, leaving it for the reader to ascertain that "the public" was composed of the few hundred inhabitants of an obscure manufacturing village in Scotland.

\* See New Harmony Gazette, Vol. I. No. 1.

[For the Christian Intelligencer.]

## EXTRACTS

From Dr. Payson's Sermons, with remarks.

The Dr. says, p. 30: "All worlds, creatures and events are subject to his control, and he is under a *blessed necessity* of overruling and conducting all things in such manner, as to promote in the highest possible degree, his glory and the *universal good*. In forming and executing his purposes, therefore, he must take into view not only present, but past and future circumstances and events; not the concerns of a single individual only, but those of the whole race of beings in heaven, earth, and all the worlds around us."

How is this consistent with the doctrine of God's decreeing a large part of his creatures to an endless hell?

So the Dr. held on the same page.

"Think of the innumerable armies of heaven; the, perhaps, scarcely less numerous hosts of hell."

Does not *universal good* mean the good of every individual? How could a Universalist express himself in stronger language, than Dr. Payson in the above quotation?

The Creator of mankind, who is under what Dr. P. call a "*blessed necessity*" of overruling and conducting all things, all worlds, creatures and events, being controlled by him, must make, govern and dispose of all according to his blessed good will and pleasure. Yet the Dr. represents that the hosts of hell are scarcely less numerous than the armies of heaven. And yet God controls and conducts all worlds, creatures, and events.—At the same time the Dr. teaches that God requires his rational creatures to love him with all their hearts, while he has no love, no pity, no mercy, so as to bless them. He brings them into the world with natures wholly sinful; he only can change them; he will not do it; but will hold them in existence to hate him, and to be hated by him: and to suffer his Almighty power and wrath to all eternity.

Now how is it possible for the human mind to conceive of a worse character than the above doctrine of Dr. Payson ascribes to a God of love? If there is a hateful being in the universe, where can he be found if this is not?

But what joy does it give to man, if God is under the *blessed necessity* of overruling and conducting all things in such a manner as to promote in the highest possible degree, his glory and the *universal good*!

P. 66. The Dr. says, "If Christ be not God, all the divine glory is given to another. The glory of creating all things, of upholding all things, of governing all things, of redeeming and judging the world, is all given to Christ."

I ask if Christ be God, who could give him all this glory? If Christ be God, he eternally possessed all the glory, how then was it given him. When one gives and another receives, it supposes two beings: for where is the property of one person or being giving himself that which he always possessed? Hence the very statement which the Dr. makes, refutes his own creed. But the Dr. does not teach that God and Christ are two beings. See p. 333. "And when he has thus obtained his injured Saviour's forgiveness, he will through his intercession obtain forgiveness of God." And in many other places.

P. 145. Dr. P. informs that every sin is an infinite evil, because God is an infinite being. Hence a child's sin is as great as the sin of the greatest creature in the universe. But what reason is there in this? Would it not be more consistent to estimate the evil of sin by the capacity of the actor, the knowledge, and the power of the sinner?

Again 146, 147. The Dr. argues that as his sin is infinite, sin deserves infinite punishment, and it is just with God to inflict it; hence as it is just, God must inflict it." How then pray, will any one escape endless misery? According to the above reasoning, I see no chance for one; for all have sinned.

Yet the Dr. supposes that a divine being has suffered and died to atone for infinite sin. But after all, it seems an infinite atonement will not induce God to renew and save all men. How then does it appear that there was an infinite sacrifice? If God has obtained infinite satisfaction by dying to satisfy his own justice, and has all the power to subdue sinners to himself, why does he not convert them? But it seems according to the Dr.'s creed God must damn eternally about as many as he saves to satisfy his justice. Or he does not desire to have his creatures holy and happy. It seems he makes them wicked, then blames and punishes them forever, to glorify his wrath, which the agonies and death of the Almighty could not glorify. What can be more horrible! Such doctrine may drive to despair and torment, but how can it produce love and truth.

## CHRISTIAN PREACHER—NO. 3.

The March No. of this work is in press and will be ready for subscribers by the 15th of the month—next Tuesday. It contains two Sermons—one by REV. C. LE FEBRE of Troy, N. Y. and the other by REV. LEMUEL WILLIS of Salem, Mass.

New Subscribers can be supplied with the back numbers.

## REMOVAL.

We learn that BR. N. C. FLETCHER, of Lisbon, Me., has been invited to settle over the Universalist Societies in Gallipolis and Chillicothe, Ohio, and that he will remove thither the latter part of April. He will be followed by the affectionate prayers of his numerous friends in Maine for his prosperity and happiness.

## BALFOUR'S REPLY TO STUART.

A just notice of this work and the history of circumstances which have called for its publication, will be found on our last page, from the pen of the editor of the *Trumpet*. We invite, also, the attention of our readers to the recommendation of Rev. Hosea Ballou on the first page.

## NEW SOCIETY.

A Society of Universalists was duly organized at Liberty Corners, Cohocton, N. Y. about the first of last month, consisting of thirty-four members.

## NEW MEETING HOUSE.

Arrangements have been made for building a Universalist meeting-house in Berlin, Conn. the ensuing season.

## CONFERENCE.

A Conference of Universalists will be held in Hope, Me. on the 24th and 25th inst.

the blessed hope of life and immortality, when they look into the history of these times, and learn that divines of this day were employed in most earnest endeavors to prove, by a few words of Hebrew, and Greek, that the Fountain of infinite goodness has doomed some of his rational offspring to a state of never-ending, unmerciful suffering.

With devout desires for the promotion of truth among all people, I am, dear brethren your most humble servant.

H. BALLOU.

## THE INTELLIGENCER.

"And Truth diffuse her radiance from the press."

GARDNER, FRIDAY, MARCH 1.

## "THE HONEST WATERMAN," AGAIN.

CONVERSATION

Between a Friend and the Editor.

**Friend.**—Our orthodox neighbors are quite offended with you, Mr. D. and some of them call you hard names on account of your article last week on the subject of the Tract, entitled "The Honest Waterman."

**Editor.**—Indeed! I am very sorry that any should be offended, much more that they should call hard names on that account. I fear they know not what spirit they are of. But why are they offended? Is it because I have ventured, in the discharge of what was regarded a duty, to expose the falsehood of one of their Tracts, and have endeavored to put people on their guard against fraud and deception? Is this the head and front of my offending? For this am I to be blamed?

**Fr.**—Perhaps not; but people, you know, are seldom pleased to have their errors, or those of their friends, exposed, especially by the sturdy, unyielding arguments of *figures*. They do say, however, that you did not calculate aright in reckoning the "Waterman's" wages, and the amount given away at his death.

**Ed.**—In what respect? If I made any errors, as possibly I did, seeing the article was written in haste, in the printing office, I certainly have no desire to persist in maintaining them, but shall most readily correct them. Can you point out the alleged errors?

**Fr.**—They say you reckoned his daily wages at five shillings—

**Ed.**—This was an error, I confess; but it was one in favor of the truth of the Tract: do they complain of this? The truth is, his wages seldom rose to an average of five shillings. It is so stated on page 10.

**Fr.**—You did not hear me through. They say you reckoned his wages at five shillings per day in lawful money, when it should have been reckoned as *sterling*.

**Ed.**—How do they know this? Does the Tract say he earned, daily, five shillings, *sterling*?

**Fr.**—It does not. But it calls the money he gave away in legacies *sterling*.

**Ed.**—Very well, and therefore I reckoned this in that currency. I followed the authority of the Tract strictly. Are they not willing to abide that authority?

**Fr.**—But the presumption is, that all the sums stated were intended in like currency—shillings as well as pounds.

**Ed.**—I care nothing about *presumption*; there is enough of it in the tract, no doubt, and in the course pursued by its apologists. The Tract was written in this country and in language suited to our currency as I supposed, unless in cases where *sterling* is expressly stated. However; let them have it sterling if they wish. All this will not make the story true, Is there any other error?

**Fr.**—Yes. You stated that he gave to six Societies 100 pounds each—

**Ed.**—Pardon my interrupting you. I did say so; but I find I committed an error in the statement; for on turning since to page 2, I find "there are nine of a hundred pounds to the nine different societies." So that I did not reckon enough by 300 pounds—thereby diminishing the falsehood of the tract. Is this complained of?

**Fr.**—No, at least I have not heard this complained of.

**Ed.**—I dare say, that, as anxious as they may be to criticize for the truth, they do not complain on account of errors in favor of the Tract. What was you going to say?

**Fr.**—They say you collected all he gave to Societies and then added to the amount 2500 pounds as the legacy given to his nephew. This latter sum, it is contended, embraced all which he gave away at death—*to societies, relatives, friends, &c.*

**Ed.**—Perhaps they know more about this than the Tract writer, but he has mentioned it in such a way as to begat the idea, that after he had given away, in legacies made before his death, many hundred pounds, he gave his nephew all he was worth remaining.—And this is stated to be "between two and three thousand pounds." If you will cast your eye on page 2, you will perceive, that his nephew, after enquiring the donations made by legacies, observes—"he has left me the remainder." The remainder is when the old man died worth, as I should understand it, independently of what he had given away. Hence, the Treasurer's next question is—"How much did he die worth?"—evidently wishing to know how much the "remainder" was after his donations. To which the nephew replies—"Between two and three thousand pounds." It seems to me then, that my first impression was the true one, and that this sum should be added to the legacies. The contrary of this makes a considerable difference in the account, I know; but not enough to save the tract from the brand of falsehood, after all. Of this I will satisfy you directly. Are there any more errors?

**Fr.**—Yes. They say you stated that the expense of supporting his mother and two sisters—

**Ed.**—There were more than two; see p. 4. But proved.

**Fr.**—devolved on him for several years. This cannot be true, because on p. 4 it is stated, that the sister "supported themselves many years," by needle-work; and that they assisted him to purchase his first wherry at twelve pounds.

**Ed.**—If this statement was not true, the Tract must bear the blame of it; for it is said, in so many words on p. 2, "He supported his mother and sisters after his father's death, till they died." The statements are a contradiction, it is true; but they are both made in the Tract, and the friends of it must reconcile them in the best way they can, to maintain the reputation of the Tract. Are there complaints of other errors?

**Fr.**—One other. You said the "Waterman" was

educated in a Sunday School. It was a Charity School.

**Ed.**—I acknowledge the error. It was a verbal one; arising from the fact, that Sunday Schools, when first set up in England, were charity schools. I wrote at the time from memory. But it was an error. I cheerfully recall it. There was one other remark you have not mentioned, which was an error—viz: that he received his education over a hundred years ago. He was born in 1747.

**Fr.**—I hear of no other complaints, only that you should dare to call in question the veracity of orthodox Tracts and their pious authors.

**Ed.**—I care not where falsehood comes from—a black coat or a white; a long face or a short; a lie is a lie, be its author who it may, and, please or displease, I will expose it whenever I think the interest of society requires exposure—asking permission of, and cringing to, no man—or woman.

I am safe in saying the story of the Waterman is a *FALSEHOOD*; and that it must appear such *mathematically*, notwithstanding the most liberal allowances (if they be anywhere within the bounds of reason and probability) which may be claimed and granted in favor of it. I venture to say, there is not one man out of fifty who may read the tract, that will not be inwardly convinced from the very face of the extravagant story, of its falsehood. I doubt whether the orthodox themselves, anxious as they are to apologize for and defend the thing, really believe it. Why, even the Treasurer, upon whom the nephew waited with fifty pounds, knowing the ordinary wages of watermen, could hardly believe that the hero of the story could have accumulated enough to give away even *that sum*. To him in the very outset, the account appeared improbable; but if it appeared improbable *then* to one who lived in London and knew what watermen's wages were, how much *more* improbable must it appear to the reader as he proceeds with the Tract, learns what his expenses were, what large sums he "constantly" and "daily" gave to Missionaries, poor people, &c. Figures are not needed to prove the falsehood of the story. Reason and probability are widely against it; and a man who can swallow it as truth must it seems to me, be prepared to swallow anything—no matter what—if it has but the stamp of Calvinistic orthodoxy on it.

Now, the above sentiment is not advanced because it is controverted, but because it is in the mouth of almost every man in community—many of whom, in the ordinary concerns of life—in the business transactions between man and man—are upright, honorable and honest; but who, in other things of great moral importance, are neither. As men of veracity, strict integrity, and fair dealing in their daily intercourse with men, they appear as polished pillars in the social edifice, on whom may repose with apparent security, individual and public confidence. But as they are prominent parts of the structure, we will approach and examine them, to see whether, while they appear beautiful in the distance, the gilding is not tarnished, or their stately forms "full of dead men's bones."

It is notorious, that such is the state of public opinion, that certain uncandid and hypocritical meanness, because practised by men otherwise respectable, are winked at, or wholly overlooked—especially when they relate to subjects of religion. Have these men made up their minds concerning religion, with the same caution that they would use respecting a course of speculation, or the results of a common bargain? Are they as ingenuous, upright and persevering in their religious principles and professions, as in the business of life? Are they as punctilious in preserving the truth, respecting their opinions—as cautious of the imputation of hypocrisy, in their religious professions, as in the most trivial, temporal concerns? And are they as much concerned to leave a favorable impression upon the mind of the rising generation, respecting their religious integrity, as in almost any thing else?—That there are thousands and tens of thousands of men, in other respects, of the highest moral worth, for whom these questions cannot be answered in the affirmative, cannot be denied. They are the sociables of every party, and for the time, the believers with every sect under heaven.

With an unbeliever, they profess not to have formed an opinion—do not see how people find it possible to believe the Bible—and take their turn in cracking the silly joke upon the professors of Christianity—and especially upon the men of "the black cloth," with the utmost condescension.—It is amusing to see them quail, perhaps the next moment, in the presence of those whom, out of pure good nature, they had insulted. And they will embrace the very earliest opportunity to whisper, that their previous associate was an infidel—a man of no principle.

With an orthodox man, they are for strenuous measures—think of joining the church—will take a pew at least—wonder that men have so little interest in religion hold the mystery of the Trinity as the most important fundamental in the doctrine of the church, and have little doubt that the justice of God will be glorified in the endless damnation of the finally impotent.

The next hour brings them into a circle of Universalists, where they recite, with great glee, the particulars of their last interview—except what they have actually done; and are very sorry that they were from home, or were detained by a cold, or by company, from the last meeting.

**Fr.**—Upwards of 43 years, as appears by page 10.

**Ed.**—Call the "upwards" two years, and say 45—give them all they can reasonably ask. Now multiply his annual income (277,16) by 45, the number of years he was in service.

**Fr.**—I know not; but from reading the Tract should infer that he gave away in charity more than what we have found to be his annual income. Living is expensive in London—rents, (for he hired a house it seems) are high, and taxes are not small. If we say it took half of what he earned to support him and maintain his multitude of charities, and allow that he kept the other half till his death to give away, I think we should be as liberal as could be asked.

**Ed.**—Well. He had at his death, "between two and three thousand pounds." Split the difference and say 2500 pounds. For the sake of accommodation, I will now allow, that this sum embraced all he was worth including what he had given away by legacy. It would have taken you, think, at least an equal sum to maintain him fifty-three years in comfortable circumstances. He then must have expended during life, and given away at death, at least 5000 pounds sterling. How much is this?

**Fr.**—I will tell you in a moment \* \* \* \* \* multiplied by 44, (a pound sterling) is, £2, 22, 22.

**Ed.**—Now say how many years he was engaged in business.

**Fr.**—Upwards of 43 years, as appears by page 10.

**Ed.**—Call the "upwards" two years, and say 45—give them all they can reasonably ask. Now multiply his annual income (277,16) by 45, the number of years he was in service.

**Fr.**—The result is £13,472,20.

**Ed.**—I will now thank you to subtract what he earned from what he expended and gave away, and inform me how much the Honest Waterman gave away, &c. more than he came honestly by during his whole life.

**Fr.**—The excess of expenditures over his receipts were £9,730,02!!

**Ed.**—So then, after all the allowances in favor of our orthodox neighbors, the Tract turns out, as last week, to be a palpable FALSEHOOD!

**Fr.**—It seems so—it cannot be otherwise.

**Ed.**—Well, this is all I said last week; and if we made any error in calculation, then, those errors do not save the Tract from the brand of falsehood. I am not desirous as to the *precise sum*, in the amount of which the Tract is proved false. It is enough that it is *false*. Let the friends of falsehood apologize for and circulate the refuted tale; the friends of truth—complained of as they may be—will not cease to warn society of "wolves in sheep's clothing."

But the truth is, the orthodox have no right to claim every allowance, not warranted by the tract itself, in their favor; though in the above we have conceded all to them. An exact calculation, warranted by plain statements and fair inferences in the Tract itself,

I would ask if Christ be God, or only the image of God, and has so much compassion for the souls of men, why will he not exert his all conquering power and grace and make them willing?

P. 323. Dr. P. says, "If sinners ought to love him, (God) who created them, because he is the former of their bodies, and the father of their spirits, ought not you, (Christians) much more to love him for creating you anew in Christ Jesus unto good works?"

I ask what reason have sinners to love God, who made them with natures totally sinful, whom he has determined shall remain so to all eternity? For according to the Dr.'s creed all mankind are thus made, and no one can change them, but their Maker, and he will not do it. Christians, to be sure, who have been quickened and will be certainly saved, are under obligation to return love for love. But how can any of the reprobate, be under obligation to love God, who has no purpose of love to them, but calls them into existences with a corrupt nature, and intends to leave them to choose all the means of grace, and favors of providence, and to punish everlasting? If God does not love, and design good to his creatures, they would not be bound to love and serve him; of course they could not sin in refusing to obey. Such depraved natures cannot love God if they would, and if he designs their endless woe, they ought not if they could. For no being can hate or treat them worse. Hence no being ought to be hated and opposed more. But such opinions do not agree with the love of God, which he manifests in Christ Jesus. Here God's love determines that the vilest sinners shall be subdued and eternally saved to the glory of his grace. S.

(To be continued.)

[For the Christian Intelligencer.]

#### SHORT SERMONS—NO. 86.

TEXT.—"If thou sinest what dost thou against him? or if thy transgressions be multiplied, what dost thou unto him? If thou be righteous what givest thou him? or what receivest he of thine hand? thy wickedness may hurt man as thou art; and thy righteousness may profit the Son of man."—Job 5:6, 7, 8.

These questions, and declarations were put by Elihu to Job. After Job's three friends had ceased conversing with him, Elihu, a young man, who had been a hearer, offered to show his opinion. His words were not reproved by God as Job's three friends had been. They were accused of not speaking the thing that was right, as Job had. Hence we may conclude that Elihu was more correct in his opinions. Now, what is the import of our text? When Elihu asks Job, "If thou sinest what dost thou against him? if thy transgressions be multiplied, what dost thou unto him?" these questions seem to imply, that the sins and transgressions of men cannot reach or injure the divine Being. God is so far exalted in perfection and glory that no action or event among creatures on earth can change his nature or purpose. His council standeth and he doth all his pleasure, in the army of heaven above, and among the people of the earth below. God is unchangeable. His happiness can no more be disturbed by the wickedness of mankind, than the throne of heaven can be moved by feeble insects of an hour.

The same sentiment is expressed by the devout Psalmist, "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The Kings of the earth sit themselves and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against his anointed." But this opposition of the ungodly against God and his Son, can have no effect to prostrate the purposes of the Most High. Instead of being moved or turned out of the way of holy love and heavenly peace, the Almighty permits or overrules all the wrath and wickedness of man to display his own glory, and to promote the highest good of the universe. This is evident from the nature of the divine perfections; and from all those communications which God has made in the holy Scriptures. God speaks by the prophet Isaiah, concerning one of the most haughty and powerful of the ungodly, "O Assyria, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. I will send him against an hypocritical nation; and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets. Howbeit he meaneth not so neither doth his heart think so; but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few." Here one of the most proud and oppressive, among men, is represented as perfectly dependent on God; of course he could not disturb or frustrate the plan of the Almighty. The prophet asks, "Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith? Or shall the saw magnify itself against him that shaketh it? as if the rod should shake itself against them that lift it up, or as if the staff should lift up itself, as if it were no wood?" In these words, the Assyrian King is represented as depending on God, as the axe, saw and staff upon those who use them. Surely, then, the words of Elihu, are correct: "if thou sinest what dost thou against him?"

Again, "If thou be righteous, what givest thou him? or what receivest he of thy hand?" God is the everlasting fountain of good. All the goodness among creatures, are but streams from the unchangeable fountain. So the inspired apostle teaches. Every good gift is from God. He is good to all mankind. Hence, all that men can possess, or render to the Lord, is his property first. He first gave them, or they could have nothing to give him. They can only give the Lord his own. And shall they demand praise for

this? They would not be just to withhold, what he has lent them, and requires them to restore.

As the being and powers of men are derived from their Maker, they can give him nothing which is not the product of his own offspring and goodness. So of all their means of knowledge and improvement, all their time and privileges: all their success and enjoyments. Have they wisdom, God gives it liberally to those that ask him. Do they ask of God, he invites and enables them so to do. Have they love, God sheds it abroad in the heart, by his spirit. Do they repent of their sins, Christ is exalted to give repentance and remission of sins. Do they believe the truth, God reveals it, and gives them faith to receive the word with meekness. So of every christian grace. The fruits of the spirit are all the product of divine power and grace, and yet the exercises of the christian. It is God who worketh in him, both to will and do of his good pleasure. So our Saviour taught, when ye have done all say we are unprofitable servants; we have done what was our duty to do.

But, "thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art, and thy righteousness may profit the son of man." Yes, good works, are good and profitable unto men. Though men cannot be profitable to God, they may be unto themselves. They may give to one another what belongs to God, but not to him, what belongs to another. God is happy in doing good to his creatures. This is his glory. For his pleasure and praise all things were created.—He thus made all things for himself. If God did not need his works to promote his own glory and happiness, he would not have made all things. There was no one but himself in existence when he began to create, hence there could be no other influential cause. There was no other object but his own pleasure, which could operate as a motive.

The perfection and happiness of rational creatures, when they were not in existence, could be of no object of care or concern. But God could determine to display his own attributes in creation, and give himself pleasure in so doing. And by making creatures dependant upon himself, he has not made them independent of each other. They exist by means, as well as by a cause. Though God is the first cause of all creatures, yet he makes creatures second, or instrumental causes of their present existence, and happiness.

God's chief care or concern when he began creation must be himself. And this care or concern he always had, and always will have, to display his divine perfections, and promote his own felicity.—He eternally contemplated and purposed to create and bless his creatures, and this was his happiness. And this happiness he will always enjoy. When creatures are brought to possess the same, or similar views, and feelings, they will enjoy in their measure, the same glory and happiness. Hence, mankind may do each other good, as well as themselves, when they regard their Maker with supreme love, and their neighbor as themselves. S.

#### THE CHRONICLE.

"And catch the manners living as they rise."

GARDINER, FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1831.

MAINE LEGISLATURE.—Several important bills have been introduced into the Legislature, which have passed stages,—among which are the bill making a new appointment of Senators and Representatives; a bill revising the present Militia System; a bill relating to Banks; a tax bill, &c. &c. We shall endeavor to keep our readers advised of the final doings on all subjects of general interest.

Yesterday at 11 o'clock was assigned for considering the report of the Committee on the subject of appropriations for the public Buildings in Augusta. Hon. John Ruggles, Speaker of the House, having been appointed Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, in the place of Judge, now Gov. Smith, has resigned his station as Speaker and member of the House; and Hon. Benjamin White, of Monmouth, in this county, has been elected Speaker in his stead.

CONGRESS.—This body adjourned, by constitutional necessity, on the 31st instant. Previously to the adjournment several bills were finally acted upon. On the retirement of the Vice President from the Senate, Mr. Tazewell, Senator from Virginia, was elected President *pro tem.* He declined the appointment, and Gen. Smith, of Maryland, was elected.

SMALL POX.—Little danger, we think, need be apprehended from the prevalence of the small pox in Augusta. The person who has it, is doing very well; and no new case has taken place.

FEST.—Gov. Lincoln, of Massachusetts, has appointed Thursday, April 7, for the annual Fast in that State.

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Since our last we have received a communication from Rev. Samuel Baker of Dexter. We do not doubt that his article "was written in candor and good will." The reason it has not yet appeared has nothing to do with any doubts as to that subject. The truth is, it is a very long article, and, as we conceive, does not meet the point of our former article. Mr. B. thinks that as we gave a view of its contents, we are bound to insert it at length. We do not regard things in this light. He does not charge us with "any unfair representations" of his communication. It was our honest intention to give the substance of it fairly to the reader in a short form. We have no particular objection to publishing the article entire. Its length and our want of room are the principal reasons, added to the fact that it does not reply to the point actually intended by us, why we have not been able, nor thought it necessary, to publish it at length. But as Mr. B. seems to have a pretty strong desire on the subject, we now say it shall appear next week.

Why do we not hear from "Medicus" and "Anti-Materialist?"

#### RESIDENCE OF VOTERS AND PRINTED BALLOTS.

The Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court have communicated to the Legislature their opinions as to the proper construction of the Constitutional provisions relating to the residence of voters and the use of printed votes. The questions submitted to the court and their answers thereto will be found below. We have no room for the reasons which they adduce as the foundation of their replies. By their decision it seems that printed votes are equally legal with written ones.

To the honorable, the House of Representatives of the State of Maine.

The undersigned Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court have been furnished with copies of your Order of the 26th of January last, requesting the opinions of the Justices of said Court on the following questions.

QUESTION 1. Is a citizen of the United States, under the first section of the second article of the Constitution; who has had an established residence in this State for the term of three months next preceding any election, an elector for Governor, Senators and Representatives in the Town or Plantation where he has an established residence at the time of such election, but where he has had such established residence for a less period than three months?

QUESTION 2. Do printed ballots come within the meaning of that part of the same section which requires that elections shall be by written ballots?

To the first question proposed, they answer in the negative; and to the second question proposed, they answer in the affirmative.

All which is respectfully submitted,

PRENTISS MELLEN,

NATHAN WESTON, Jr.

ALBION K. PARRIS.

#### MAINE LEGISLATURE.

##### Senate.

Saturday March, 5.—Leave to withdraw petition was granted to George Vincent and others.

Petition of Seward Porter for extension of time for putting a steam-boat on Seabago and Long Ponds, received and committed.

Several Bills passed stages.

Tuesday, March 8.—Petition of inhabitants of Bowdoin and Lisbon was taken from the files and committed.

##### House.

Bill to establish Read Ferry company passed to be enacted.

The order for requesting the opinion of the Justices of the Supreme Court as to the meaning of the constitution in relation to the apportionment of Representatives was called up, and on motion of Mr. Knowlton was indefinitely postponed, yeas, 72, nays 56.

Resolve in favor of Wm. King, Agent for this State in adjusting the Massachusetts claim against the United States, was read once, and some discussion arose as to giving it a second reading, when on motion of Mr. Herrick of Lewiston it was recommitted for the purpose of obtaining further information concerning the services of the Agent, and the amount of yeas, 72, nays 56.

Resolve in favor of Wm. King, Agent for this State in adjusting the Massachusetts claim against the United States, was read once, and some discussion arose as to giving it a second reading, when on motion of Mr. Herrick of Lewiston it was recommitted for the purpose of obtaining further information concerning the services of the Agent, and the amount of yeas, 72, nays 56.

A Vienna paper, of Jan. 10, says—“Private letters mention that an Austrian corps, 50,000 strong, under the orders of General Stutterheim, is concentrating in Galicia for the purpose of protecting the frontiers of that Province next to Poland. All the officers belonging to the regiments of that corps who were on leave of absence have received orders to join immediately.”

IRELAND. The excitement in Ireland continued unabated, although some of the papers were of opinion that it would subside if O'Connell should be convicted and imprisoned, though we can discern no reason for this conclusion. The Lord Lieutenant acted with energy. The Grand Jury found true bills against O'Connell, Steele, Dwyer, Lawless; Cloney, Reynolds, Redmond, Sheridan, and Bartlett.

A correspondent of the London Courier

says that “the Government are determined to crush O'Connell, and upon the present prosecution hangs the peace of the country.”

FRANCE. We have nothing additional of a positive and authentic character, although abundance of speculations. As formerly, the ministry are disposed to avoid war, if possible, and the high revolutionary party among whom is La Fayette, are for opposing at all hazards, any attempts of the allies to interfere with Poland and Belgium.

BELGIUM. The Belgians had not yet agreed upon a monarch. Some were for the King of France, some for his second son, the Duke of Nemours, and some were for the Duke of Leuchtenberg, son of Prince Eugene; the greater portion were for the latter.

JOHN RUGGLES.

On motion of Mr. White of Monmouth the House then passed a vote of thanks to the Speaker, for the able and satisfactory manner in which he has discharged the arduous and responsible duties of the chair in the present session, and requesting him to accept their respects and best wishes for his continued health and usefulness. The Speaker then addressed the House in reply, and also the office of Representative in the Legislature, which I hold at the hands of

my constituents.

Mr. White was therupon declared duly elected, and took the chair and made

an address to the House as follows:

Gentlemen, permit me to tender you my grateful acknowledgments for the distinguished honor you have conferred upon me in assigning me this station. I fear I shall not meet your expectations, more especially when I compare my own inability and want of experience with the talents and superior qualifications of the gentleman who has preceded me in this place. All I can promise is my best endeavors to facilitate and bring to an early close the business of the session, relying, as I must, upon your charity and assistance.

Tuesday, March 8.—Resolved finally passed, in favor of Wm. King, in favor of Anson Academy, for apportionment of Representatives.

On motion of Mr. Boutelle the committee on the Judiciary was instructed to inquire into the expediency of providing by law that no Judges of Probate or other Courts who are by law required to publish notices in newspapers, shall directly or indirectly have any pecuniary interest in any newspaper in their respective counties, and shall also be required

to publish such notices in such papers as shall be selected by the executors, administrators, and parties interested, unless such selection appear to be unreasonable or for a fraudulent purpose.

Remonstrance of R. H. Gardiner and others against the construction of a boom across Kennebec river was received and committed.

Messrs. Clifford, Deane and Knowlton, were appointed conferees on the part of the House on the Bill regulating Banks and Banking.

#### FOREIGN.

The packet-ship Silas Richards, arrived at New York, and brought London papers to the 25th of January, and Liverpool to the 26th.

The Polish Diet have issued a Manifesto, in which they set forth in strong colors, a long list of their grievances. It is drawn up with great boldness and strength, and must command universal attention. It is considered by the London Times as the most important exposé of National grievances which has been given to the world since the celebrated declaration of independence by the United States of North America. The editors add, “The wrongs of the Poles are infinitely greater than those of our former American colonists; their resolution to redress them seems to be taken with equal courage.—Let us hope that it will be followed with the same heroic perseverance, and terminate in the same glorious result.”

The people of Basle, in Switzerland, have fallen into a violent contest—the city of Basle being divided against the country part of the canton on the proportion of representation which should be enjoyed by each in the Grand Council. The peasants were in arms, and an attack upon the city was expected. The citizens had made preparations for defence, and the streets were unpaved and barricaded.

There are renewed rumors of the sickness and death of Don Miguel, of Portugal. The questions seem to be appropriate and such as will arise in examinations; and the answers (though generally short, sufficiently comprehensive to assist and refresh the memory of the pupil, and give him a basis of reflection.

I think the introduction into our schools, while it will afford the pupil a valuable Guide, will lighten the task of the Instructor, and give him time for such remarks and illustrations which the nature of the subjects in question, will naturally excite in an experienced man. Any thing which will promote the great object of education in our primary schools is of the utmost importance, and I should receive the cordial support of an enlightened public. I trust, gentlemen, that the approbation of those most deeply interested in the cause of education will not be withheld.

Respectfully yours,

E. HOLMES.

Sturte, Feb. 8, 1831.

#### SCHOLAR'S EXERCISE & REVIEW.

JUST published, and for sale by Wm. PALMER, the principal RULES of English Grammar and Arithmetic, and a key to many difficult questions in the latter—the whole designed for the use of Scholars and private instruction. By ROBERT MARTIN and GEO. C. WHITNEY.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS.

From MOSES SPRINGER, Jr. Esq. Gardiner.

I have examined the Scholar's Exercise and Review, published by Messrs. Martin & Whitney, and think it a work admirably adapted to facilitate the study of English Grammar and Arithmetic in our common Schools.

The plan of introducing questions into elementary books for the purpose of review has long been practised. This work appears designed not only for this purpose, but also to relieve the instructor from much of the perplexity and delay which results from the constant and repeated verbal explanations which are usually required by his scholars. Almost every question which the intelligent pupil would ask in these branches will be found answered here in clear and full number. The authors of this work certainly deserve much credit for the manner in which they have simplified many of the abstruse points both in Grammar and Arithmetic.

From a careful examination of the work I do not hesitate to recommend it as a valuable assistant both to instructors and pupils.

MOSES SPRINGER, Jr.

Gardiner, Jan. 11, 1831.

From ISAAC PECK Rector of Christ's Church, Gardiner.

GARDINER, JAN. 28, 1831.—Having examined the Scholar's Exercise and Review, I fully concur in the above estimate of its merit by Mr. Springer and cheerfully agree with him in recommending it to those who are employed in these elementary branches of instruction.

ISAAC PECK.

From EZEKIEL HOLMES, M. D.

Messrs. Martin & Whitney—I have received the "Scholar's Exercise and Review," recently published by you. I have had time to examine it

## POETRY.

## 'TWAS BUT A BABE.

I asked them why the verdant turf was riven  
From its firm rooting, and with a silent lip  
They pointed to a new-made clausum among  
The marble pillars'd mansions of death.  
Who goeth to his rest in you damp couch?  
The fearless crowd pass on. "Twas but a babe.  
*A babe!* And as ye poise in the stern scales  
Of calculation, the fond bosom's wealth,  
Rating its princeless idols as ye weigh  
Such merchandise as man and rust corrupt,  
Or the rule robes steal. Ye mete out grief  
Perchance, when youth, maturity or age  
Sink in the thronging tomb; but when the breath  
Grows icy on the lip of innocence,  
Release your wearied sympathies, and say,  
"Twas but a babe."

What know ye of her love,

Who patient watchest till the stars grow dim,  
Over her drooping infant, with an eye  
Bright as unchanging Hope, if he repose?  
What know ye of her woe, who sought no joy  
More exquisite, than on his placid brow  
To trace the glow of health, and drink at dawn,  
The ardent lustre of his waking smile?

Go ask that nursing father why the grave  
So narrow and so notesome, might not close  
Without a tear, and though his lips be mute,  
Feeling the poverty of speech to give.  
Fit answer to thee, still thy paifd brow.  
And the deep agonizing prayer, that looks  
Midnight's dark wing for Hian, the God of strength;  
Who dealeath balsam to the broken heart,  
May satisfy thy question.

Ye who mourn  
Whene'er you vacant cradle, or the robes  
That deck'd the lost one's form, awake a tide  
Of recollect'd joy, can ye not trust  
Your treasure to His arms whose unchangeable care  
Passeth a mother's love!—Can ye not hope  
When a few hasty years their race have run,  
To go to him, though he no more on earth  
Returns to you?

And when glad Faith doth hear,  
To cheer her 'mid the ceaseless toil of earth,  
Some echo of celestial harmonies,  
Archangel's praises, and the high response  
Of seraphim, with cherub's trilling strain,  
Think that your babe is there.

L. H. S.

## MISCELLANY.

From the Trumpet and Magazine.]

## NEW PUBLICATION.

*Reply to Professor Stuart's Exegetical Essays on several words relating to Future Punishment.* By Walter Balfour, Charleston, Mass. Boston, printed for the author, 1831." 12 mo. pp. 38.

The public are well acquainted with the fact, that Professor Stuart of Andover, about the middle of the year 1829, published an *Essay* on the words *Amos* and *Aionios*. This *Essay* appeared in the "Spirit of the Pilgrims," an orthodox monthly publication of this city. It was proper that the Professor should sustain the doctrine of endless misery against the attacks it had suffered from Mr. Balfour. The latter, in his *Inquiries* into the scriptural usage of certain terms, had entirely torn away the very foundation on which that doctrine had been supposed to rest. The words which had been thought to prove its endless duration, as well as those which had been relied on to designate the place of punishment itself, were shown, by a course of manly and judicious criticism, to have no just application to the dreadful doctrines they had been used to support. The eyes of the community were turned to Professor Stuart, because it was by his means that Mr. Balfour had been first led to doubt the truth of a sentiment which he had for years regarded as a plainly revealed scriptural truth. To this circumstance Mr. Balfour refers in the following passage, which, from a strong desire to keep the history of the transaction fresh in the public mind, we here give:

"It was in reading Mr. Stuart's Letters to Dr. Channing, in the year 1819, doubts were first created in my mind, that the doctrine of endless misery might be false. They were created by his comments on Phillip, ii. 10, 1, and Rev. v. 8-14. See Mr. Stuart's Letters, pp. 10, 10, 10, 10, ed. Being unable to reconcile his comments on these texts, with the doctrine of endless punishment, I laid before him my difficulties, in a series of letters, published in the Universalist Magazine, in 1820, signed 'An Inquirer after Truth.' In these letters, I urged Mr. Stuart, in an earnest and respectful manner, to relieve my difficulties, by reconciling his comments with this doctrine. But this he declined, and urged among other things, his official duties as his excuse.—See his letter published in the Universalist Magazine, 1821. Finding he would not relieve my difficulties, which his comments had unintentionally created, I had no other alternative left me, but to examine the subject more fully for myself.—My books are before the public, which are the result of that examination, and are the writings Mr. Stuart covertly attacks in his present publication. Regret is unavailing; but I do regret, and Mr. Stuart ought to regret it, that if Universal Salvation be an error, he did not give me the needed explanation. If an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, an ounce then might have prevented me from being an Universalist; for all my prejudices and habits of thinking, were in favor of endless punishment. But unfortunately, Mr. Stuart's patient is now in a different stage of this disorder, and mere simple will not probably remove his complaints. However, if my own heart does not greatly deceive me, I stand ready, calmly and candidly, to examine the evidence he may produce to show me my error."

When the Professor gave the public the *Essay* of which we have spoken, he threw out an insinuation that it was his intention to furnish a few tracts on other disputed words—which, as we all knew, were the words *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus* and *Gehenna*. Accordingly, in a full year afterwards, there appeared from the Andover press, his "Exegetical Essays on Several words relating to Future punishment."—This book consisted of a republication of the *Essay* on *Amos* and *Aionios*, which had been then twelve months before the public, to which were added essays on the

words *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus*, and *Gehenna*, all of which were by far too brief for the importance of the subject embraced. Although there can be no question that the Professor thought himself called on to write by the circumstance that he had converted Mr. Balfour to Universalism, or at least, put him on those inquiries which resulted in his conversion; and although he unquestionably wrote to counteract the effect of Mr. Balfour's publications—and moreover, although he once or twice cautiously refers to them,\* he had not the magnanimity in a single instance to name the author to whom he was replying.—This trick (we can give it no other name) was played for a particular purpose. The Professor had no desire to enter the lists as a controversialist, on the subject discussed in his *Essays*. Of all subjects the orthodox dread this the most. They act precisely as though they were conscious that the doctrine of endless misery rested on a sandy foundation, or rather that, like the bottomless pit, it had no foundation at all. Their policy is to make a show of defence; but, in reality, to do all in their power to quash the controversy—to turn the public mind to other subjects, and prevent investigation and reflection on this.—If such be not the policy of the orthodox leaders in New England, we are grossly deceived by the measures they have adopted.

The work before us is a Reply to the Professor's *Exegetical Essays*. It is divided into five letters. The whole argument is conducted in the form of a *gentleman's address* to the Professor. Of the Letters the first is by far the longest. It is devoted to the consideration of that *Essay* of the Professor in which he treats of the word *aion* and its derivatives. We are pleased with the strain of the following paragraph. Nothing ever was more just than the opinion Mr. Balfour here expresses:

'You express your hope—' that there are some, at least, who will feel it to be their duty and their interest, seriously and impartially to examine and consider, what the scriptures have said, relative to the important question about the duration of future happiness or misery.' My fear is, sir, that many, very many, will not do this, but will go on, believing just as the church believes about it. If a man wishes to continue a believer in endless punishment, my advice to him is, not to think, or read, or examine this subject *seriously and impartially*. If he does venture to do this, and is not embarrassed by worldly considerations, he will soon abandon this doctrine. I beseech you, sir, to go on with the work of investigation. No class of people are more pleased than Universalists are, that you have come forward to defend endless punishment. They court an appeal to the Bible, 'investigated by means of the usual and impartial principles of interpretation,' on the point in question. Let it, however, be distinctly remembered, they do not admit that your sect is infallible, or that you are the only people who can interpret the scriptures by just rules of interpretation.'

After some very pertinent observations in regard to true principles of interpretation, Mr. Balfour proceeds to take up, in their regular order from the Professor's work, his several classifications of *aion*, and the corresponding Hebrew word. It is not possible for us to convey an idea of the arguments. They are thorough and satisfactory. In many cases they are a repetition of what has appeared in his other works; but this was unavoidable. The criticisms which he gave in his two *Inquiries*, seem to have acquired fresh brightness from the fire of controversy through which they have passed; and it is a triumphant refutation of some of the Professor's principal positions merely to state said arguments and criticisms again.

Letter second is devoted to the examination of the Professor's *Essay* in regard to *Sheol*; Letter third to *Hades*; Letter fourth to *Tartarus*; Letter fifth to *Gehenna*.

In each of these different sections of the book, the reader will be amused with the pungency of the author's questions, his home thrusts at the Professor's creed, the exposure of his inconsistencies, and the detection of his sophisms. We recommend the work most cheerfully to all Universalists, and to such in other denominations as are truly free inquirers, and are not wedded to systems in preference to truth. It has become the duty of Universalists to see that Mr. Balfour does not suffer loss, in a pecuniary sense, by the works which he has published. If each would purchase one copy, the author would be well remunerated. Very few people know the trouble and vexation attendant on the publishing and vending of books. Besides the labor of writing, proof-reading, &c. &c., money must be advanced for paper, for printing, for binding. A few copies are sold at retail, half enough to pay the cost; the rest are sent out through the country; and the author by hard dunning gets money enough back in a few years to pay the first cost of the work. These considerations induce us to urge on our friends, the duty of purchasing forthwith a copy of the work before us. For its size, the price, seventy-five cents, is low. It contains 240 pages. Professor Stuart's book, not so large by nearly 100 pages, is sold (if any body buys it) at the same price. Let those borrow who cannot afford to buy; but let all purchase who have the means.

\* See pp. 12, 13, 151 of the "Exegetical Essays."

HINTS ON READING.—Many persons read as if to find the end of the book were their sole object without any regard to improvement. In some this arises, proba-

bly, from the vanity of being thought to have read extensively. Others read for the purpose of mere amusement, or to pass away a leisure hour. Nothing can be more injurious to the mental faculties than this indolent manner of reading.—From being accustomed to be the passive recipient of knowledge, the mind becomes relaxed and incapable of active exertion. The little knowledge acquired being, from want of reflection, *ridicule* *moles*, is incapable of being brought forward at pleasure, or usefully applied.

The method which Hamilton practised, was to read a page, then shut the book and try how much he could remember.—The practice of transcribing works of particular value is eminently calculated to fix their contents in the memory. Demosthenes transcribed Thucydides' History of Greece eight times. A gentleman of our country now a distinguished member of Congress, it is said, has transcribed Hume's History of England, almost as often.—The celebrated Professor Porson, twice copied a huge Greek Lexicon, which cost immense labor.

One of the best methods of profiting by reading perhaps, is epitomizing. A distinguished gentleman, now at the head of our colleges, used to tell his scholars,

"whenever you so thoroughly understand any author, as to be able to construct an extended table of contents of his writings you have completely mastered him." And indeed to condense the writings of any author, so as to comprehend his most important ideas, those most worthy remembrance, within a brief space, requires more labor and greater mental effort of those unpractised in it than might be supposed. No exercise, however, can be more beneficial, and a little practice will enable any one to perform it with remarkable facility. In addition to the direct advantage accruing from this practice, in treasuring up knowledge, another important object is gained. There are few authors the whole of whose works it would be useful to read and remember. To be able to cast the eye over a page, and select with rapidity such passages as are worthy of being read and remembered, is a valuable attainment.—This talent was possessed in an extraordinary degree by Sir Isaac Newton, who would read a common work almost as rapidly as he could turn over the leaves, at the same time that he retained the substance of the work, by our countrywoman Hannah Adams; and by the late Dr. Payson, whose powers of rapid and yet profitable reading are well known. No exercise can be better adapted to the improvement of this talent, than writing with care abridgements of good authors. History and biography are particularly fitted for this purpose. Seneca tells us that he never passed a day, without epitomising a portion of some Greek or Latin author.—*Daily Courier*.

## UNIVERSALIST LICENTIENESS.

A minister of the "common salvation," journeying in the north western part of this state, and drawing near to the village of B., overtook a lad apparently about twelve years of age, and entered into the following conversation with him:

Minister.—My son, do you reside in the next village?

Boy.—Yes sir.

M. Do you ever have preaching there?

B. Yes, every Sunday—and oftener.

M. Of what denomination are the ministers who preach among you?

B. Well, sir, of every, I suppose—they are of the methodist, baptist, presbyterian, newlight, and universalist.

M. Is it possible you have universalists in the neighborhood?—are they not an awful wicked race of beings?

B. O desperately wicked—so they say.

M. Don't they get drunk?

B. O yes, sir, they are mighty apt to.

M. And don't they lie, and cheat, and steal, and rob?

B. O dreadfully—they say they will.

M. But I should think you'd have them prosecuted, and sent off to the state's prison.

B. If they had their deserts, they would be; but they are so powerful sly, we can never catch them at it!—*Sentinel and Star in the West.*

## CALVINISM.

This system teaches that God selects from the corrupt mass of mankind, a certain number to be saved, and that they are plucked by an irresistible agency, from the common ruin, whilst the rest are commanded, under penalty of endless woe, to make a change in their characters, which their natural corruption places beyond their power, and are also promised pardon, on conditions which necessarily avail them nothing, unless they are favored with a special operation of God's grace, which he has predetermined to withhold. This mockery of mercy—this insult offered to the misery of the non-elect, by such pretended professed of forgiveness, completes the absurd system which is continually offered to us as the gospel of the grace of God.—*Religious Inquirer.*

## ANCIENT AND MODERN PHARISEES.

"Of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question."—Act. xxiii. 6.

Paul, like believers in our day, "was called in question" concerning "the hope and resurrection of the dead." Had Paul preached a resurrection and no hope, for a large portion of mankind, we believe the Pharisees would have taken him by the hand, and carried and employed him. But Paul, true to the message entrusted to him by his Divine Master, preached the doctrine of the resurrection of all men in the heavenly image of Christ, incorruptible and immortal! We appeal to the reader—Are not Universalists invariably called in question concerning their hope, and resurrection of the dead? Would

not serve time servers of the present day, give them the hand of fellowship, if they should preach a resurrection without hope, and consign millions to a never-ending hell?

N. Y. *Gospel Herald.*

## GREAT IMPROVEMENT IN MILLS.

The Subscriber has invented and applied to use, an important improvement in the Reacting Water Wheel, for which he has obtained Letters Patent, and having obtained the seal of the United States and the signature of the President, would respectfully inform the public, and especially those interested in MILL SEATS, that he is ready to answer all calls in this line. He is about establishing agencies in different sections for the convenience of the public, of which due notice will be given.

The subscriber confidently asserts, that more labor can be performed with a given water power by his wheel than by any water wheel now in use, while the expense is less than one fourth of that of the Breast Wheel. It has been found, by actual experiment, to perform twice the labor of the Tub Wheel placed in the same situation. Being on a perpendicular shaft no gearing is necessary in its application to Grist Mills and other machinery. It is peculiarly adapted to small streams with a moderate head of water, and is but little affected by back water. The wheel and shaft are both of Cast Iron and of course very durable.

This wheel is now in successful operation in the grist mill of Hon. JAMES BRIDGE, Augusta, (Me.) where the public are invited to call and examine for themselves.

JOHN TURNER.

Augusta, Dec. 1, 1830.

I hereby certify that I have lately erected a Grist Mill in Augusta, with two run of stones, the one moved by tub wheel of the most approved construction, the other by Turner's Improved Reacting Wheel. The reacting Wheel has been in operation seven weeks, and has proved itself to be decidedly preferable to the tub wheel.

JAMES BRIDGE.

Augusta, Dec. 5, 1830.

This may certify, that I, the undersigned, have for a number of years used a tub wheel for grinding flour, and have now applied to the same use and in the same situation, Turner's Improved Reacting Wheel, and have found it to perform four times the labor with the same quantity of water.

JOSEPH HAM.

## THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER,

AND UNIVERSALIST REGISTER,

IS a Monthly publication of Original Sermons, by living Universalist Ministers. The design of the work is to spread before the public the best pulpit productions of clergymen in this denomination, with a view to correct the misrepresentations which are abroad concerning our sentiments, and to promote the cause of a rational faith and of practical godliness.

Each number will contain at least 16 octavo pages. On the last two pages of the covers will be published, under the title of UNIVERSALIST REGISTER, an account of Events interesting to the Universalist denomination, short Expositions of scripture passages, &c.

TERMS.—One dollar per year, payable in advance, or on delivery of the first number. New subscribers can be furnished with all the numbers of the volume, commencing in January, 1831.

Orders for the work should be addressed (*post paid*) to WILLIAM A. DREW, Augusta, Me., who will be very thankful for any favors our Universalist brethren may grant him towards extending its circulation.

Feb. 8, 1831.

Parent Elastic Water-proof Caps.

L. L. MAUOMBER,

(Opposite McLellan's Hotel.)

WE SUBMIT call the attention of the public to his PATENT ELASTIC WATER-PROOF black and dark CAPS—(Garrisoned with India rubber)—an entire new, and a beautiful article, perfectly impervious to water—becomes hard when exposed to rain, and yet so elastic as to admit of being doubled and twisted without sustaining the least injury—an excellent article for travellers, as they may be folded like a handkerchief and packed with clothes—for sale wholesale and retail by the Patentee.

Hat manufacturers, will find it for their interest to engage in the manufacture of the above article. Terms of rights, reasonable.

Gardiner, January 19, 1831.

BUCKFIELD ACADEMY.

THE Subscribers will commence a School at Buckfield Academy on the first Monday in March for the instruction of youth in the branches of education commonly taught in Academies. Terms—Twenty-five cents per week.

ALAN DINSMORE.

Buckfield, Feb. 8, 1831.

SAILOR'S SALE.

TAKEN on Execution, and will be sold at public auction to the highest bidder, on Saturday in the forenoon, at the Gardiner Hotel, in Gardiner, all the right in equity which Justin Sprague, of Gardiner, has of reclaiming the following described real estate, viz.—A lot of land with the buildings thereon, situated in Gardiner, on the road leading from Kennebec river, between the lots of A. S. Chadwick and J. P. Hunter, to John McCausland's, and adjoining land of B. Elwell, J. Flaherty, M. Woodward and Jos. McCausland, containing about 20 acres—being the same land wherein said Spr